## 1. Summary of Opposition

1

2

3

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Debtor fails to meet her burden to justify the Court reconsidering an order that has not even been entered. As evidenced by her Motion, Debtor purposely misconstrues a narrowly-tailored abandonment order in a bad faith attempt to weaponize it against the Trustee. The Motion is frivolous, and the latest in a long series of bad faith litigation tactics by Debtor. The Motion must be denied.

#### 2. Factual Statement

On July 6, 2023, as Dk. No. 1457, a motion to compel Trustee to abandon all claims known and unknown was filed by Debtor ("Abandonment Motion"). The hearing on the Abandonment Motion was originally set for July 18, 2023, but was continued by request of Trustee to August 15, 2023.

On August 1, 2023, as Dk. No. 1510, Trustee filed an opposition to the Abandonment Motion. To conserve judicial and estate economy, Trustee incorporates the detailed and lengthy factual history set forth in his opposition.

On August 14, 2023, as Dk. No. 1517, Debtor's request to continue the hearing on the Abandonment Motion was docketed.

At the hearing on August 15, 2023, Debtor orally requested a continuance of the hearing on the Abandonment Motion, and the request was denied. Additionally, the Court found that oral argument would not be necessary on the six pending motions or objections before the Court (five initiated by Debtor and one by Trustee), and issued its rulings on the record without oral argument.

On August 23, 2023, as Dk. No. 1539, Trustee lodged a proposed order on the Abandonment Motion with a notice of lodgment.

On August 23, 2023, as Dk. No. 1542, Debtor filed the Motion, seeking to alter or amend the Court's decision on the Abandonment Motion.

25

26

27

28

# 3. Legal Argument

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

27

28

### A. Relief under Rule 60(b) is unwarranted.

"On motion and just terms, the court may relieve a party or its legal representative from a final judgment, order, or proceeding for the following reasons:

- (1) mistake, inadvertence, surprise, or excusable neglect;
- (2) newly discovered evidence that, with reasonable diligence, could not have been discovered in time to move for a new trial under Rule 59(b);
- (3) fraud (whether previously called intrinsic or extrinsic), misrepresentation, or misconduct by an opposing party;
- (4) the judgment is void;
- (5) the judgment has been satisfied, released, or discharged; it is based on an earlier judgment that has been reversed or vacated; or applying it prospectively is no longer equitable; or (6) any other reason that justifies relief.

Fed. R. Civ. Proc. 60(b) (made applicable to bankruptcy cases under FRBP 9024).

"To qualify for equitable relief under Rule 60(b)(1), the movant must demonstrate 'mistake, inadvertence, surprise, or excusable neglect." *Engleson v. Burlington N.R. Co.*, 972 F.2d 1038, 1043 (9th Cir. 1992). An additional requirement for relief under Rule 60(b)(1) is the existence of a meritorious argument. *See TCI Group Lice Insurance Plan v. Knoebber*, 244 F.3d 691, 696-97 (9th Cir. 2001) ("If, however, the defendant presents no meritorious defense, then nothing but pointless delay can result from reopening the judgment."). "Rule 60(b)(6) should be 'used sparingly as an equitable remedy to prevent manifest injustice' and 'is to be utilized only where extraordinary circumstances prevented a party from taking timely action to prevent or correct an erroneous judgment." *Zurich American Insurance Co. v. International Fibercom, Inc.* (*In re International Fibercom, Inc.*), 503 F.3d 933, 941 (9th Cir. 2007). "As 60(b)(6) is a catchall provision, relief under that section should be for a reason beyond those elsewhere enumerated by the Rule." *United States v. Turner*, 2022 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 89423 at \*8 (S.D. Cal. May 17, 2022).

The Motion contains a series of meandering arguments that conclude that Debtor is entitled to relief. Debtor only vaguely recites the language contained in FRCP 60(b)(1) as her statutory basis for relief. There is no relevant analysis to granting relief under FRCP 60(b)(1), in that Debtor fails to articulate any mistake, surprise, or excusable neglect <u>on her part</u> which resulted in the denial of the Abandonment Motion. See United Student Funds, Inc. v. Wylie (In re Wylie), 349 B.R. 204, 210

(B.A.P. 9th Cir. 2006) ("The issue is not whether the bankruptcy court made a mistake... Instead, the focus is on [Movant]."). Debtor has also failed to articulate any extraordinary circumstances requiring relief under FRCP 60(b)(6). Indeed, the Abandonment Motion sought abandonment of unspecified claims, both known and unknown. Because Debtor failed to sufficiently describe any claims to be abandoned, she could not have met her burden to compel abandonment of any claim, and the Court properly denied Debtor's motion. 6 4. 7 **Conclusion** 8 The Motion is meritless and must be denied. Trustee respectfully requests that the order lodged on August 23, 2023, be entered. 10 DATED: August 29, 2023 MARSHACK HAYS LLP 11 By: /s/ Tinho Mang 12 D. EDWARD HAYS 13 TINHO MANG General Counsel for Chapter 7 Trustee, 14 RICHARD A. MARSHACK 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28

#### PROOF OF SERVICE OF DOCUMENT

I am over the age of 18 and not a party to this bankruptcy case or adversary proceeding. My business address is: 870 Roosevelt, Irvine, CA 92620.

A true and correct copy of the foregoing document entitled <u>TRUSTEE'S OPPOSITION TO DEBTOR'S MOTION TO ALTER OR AMEND ORDER DENYING MOTION TO ABANDON ALL KNOWN AND UNKNOWN CLAIMS</u> will be served or was served (a) on the judge in chambers in the form and manner required by LBR 5005-2(d); and (b) in the manner stated below:

stated below:	age in chambers in the form and man	iner required by LDIV 3000-2(d), and (b) in the	manner
Orders and LBR, the forego 29, 2023, I checked the CM	ing document will be served by the c /ECF docket for this bankruptcy case	RONIC FILING (NEF): Pursuant to controlling court via NEF and hyperlink to the document. On adversary proceeding and determined that e NEF transmission at the email addresses st	On <u>August</u> at the
		⊠ Service information continued on att	ached page
known addresses in this ba envelope in the United State	nkruptcy case or adversary proceedir es mail, first class, postage prepaid, a	I served the following persons and/or entities ng by placing a true and correct copy thereof and addressed as follows. Listing the judge he ted no later than 24 hours after the document	in a sealed ere
DEBTOR ALICIA MARIE RICHARDS SANTA ANA JAIL M-88 ALICIA MARIE RICHARDS P.O. BOX 22003 SANTA ANA, CA 92702			
		☐ Service information continued on att	ached page
F.R.Civ.P. 5 and/or controllidelivery, overnight mail servand/or email as follows. Lis	ng LBR, on <u>August 29, 2023</u> , I serve vice, or (for those who consented in v	FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION OR EMAIL: Pured the following persons and/or entities by perviting to such service method), by facsimile trallaration that personal delivery on, or overnighent is filed.	rsonal ansmission
RONALD REAGAN FEDER	PY LARKSON IPTCY COURT, CENTRAL DISTRIC IAL BUILDING AND COURTHOUSE ET, SUITE 5130 / COURTROOM 50		
		☐ Service information continued on att	ached page
I declare under penalty of p	erjury under the laws of the United S	tates that the foregoing is true and correct.	
August 29, 2023	Cynthia Bastida Printed Name	/s/ Cynthia Bastida Signature	

This form is mandatory. It has been approved for use by the United States Bankruptcy Court for the Central District of California.

#### 1. TO BE SERVED BY THE COURT VIA NOTICE OF ELECTRONIC FILING (NEF): CONTINUED:

- ATTORNEY FOR DEBTOR AND DEFENDANT ALICIA MARIE RICHARDS: Bruce A Boice bboice@lawyer.com, r51856@notify.bestcase.com
- INTERESTED PARTY COURTESY NEF: Amanda N Ferns aferns@fernslaw.com, mmakalintal@fernslaw.com
- ATTORNEY FOR CREDITOR FIRST FINANCIAL CREDIT UNION: Daniel K Fujimoto ecf@steelellp.com, rsoriano@steelellp.com
- ATTORNEY FOR TRUSTEE RICHARD A MARSHACK (TR): D Edward Hays ehays@marshackhays.com, ehays@ecf.courtdrive.com; kfrederick@ecf.courtdrive.com; cmendoza@marshackhays.com; cmendoza@ecf.courtdrive.com
- ATTORNEY FOR TRUSTEE RICHARD A MARSHACK (TR): Richard G Heston rheston@hestonlaw.com, yflores@hestonlaw.com, docs@hestonlaw.com; HestonRR41032@notify.bestcase.com, handhecf@gmail.com
- ATTORNEY FOR CREDITOR ANDREW BROWN: Christopher J Langley chris@slclawoffice.com, omar@slclawoffice.com; langleycr75251@notify.bestcase.com; ecf123@casedriver.com
- ATTORNEY FOR TRUSTEE RICHARD A MARSHACK (TR): Tinho Mang tmang@marshackhays.com, tmang@ecf.courtdrive.com; kfrederick@ecf.courtdrive.com; cmendoza@ecf.courtdrive.com
- TRUSTEE RICHARD A MARSHACK (TR): Richard A Marshack (TR) pkraus@marshackhays.com, rmarshack@iq7technology.com; ecf.alert+Marshack@titlexi.com
- ATTORNEY FOR CREDITOR KELLY MICHELLE RICHARDS and DEFENDANT AND CREDITOR JONATHAN STEVEN RICHARDS: John H Mitchell johnmitchelllaw@yahoo.com
- ATTORNEY FOR DEFENDANT SCHOOLSFIRST FEDERAL CREDIT UNION: Paul V Reza pvr1789@gmail.com, PVRLaw@gmail.com
- ATTORNEY FOR CREDITOR KEVIN E ROBINSON and CREDITOR, DEFENDANT, and PLAINTIFF RYAL W. RICHARDS: Kevin E Robinson robinsonlawoffice@yahoo.com
- U.S. TRUSTEE (SA): United States Trustee (SA) ustpregion16.sa.ecf@usdoj.gov
- ATTORNEY FOR CREDITOR EUGENE V ZECH: Eugene V Zech evzechlaw@aol.com

4895-4289-7524, v. 1